



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,942	09/19/2003	Peng Wang	13905-019001 / 2003P00659	8436
22852	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,942	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/15/04 & 1/31/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 09/19/2003.
2. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 11/15/2004 and 01/31/2005 were received and considered. The reference "IDoc – A SearchSAP Definition" was not considered since the Examiner was unable to access to it. Copies of the reviewed IDS(s) are enclosed with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to claim 11, the "information carrier" is not limited to tangible media in accordance with Applicant's specification, which states that it may be a propagated signal, not in

Art Unit: 2164

and of itself a tangible medium. Note that amending claim 11 to recite – machine-readable storage device – would overcome this rejection.

Claims 12-20 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 11 upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, 11-13, 16, 17, 20, 21-23, 26, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanzek (US Patent No 6,980,963).

As to claim 1, Hanzek teaches:

“A method” (see Abstract, [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-55]) comprising:

“updating record content including in a database” (see [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-56]);

“extracting updated record content during a periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-62]);

“producing an internal file that includes data representing the updated record content” (see [column 25, lines 63-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant’s “internal document”);

“producing a file that includes data corresponding to content of the internal document” (see [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant’ “file”); and

“sending the file at the periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-67] and [column 26, lines 1-15]).

As to claim 11, Hanzek teaches:

“A computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier” (see Abstract, [column 6, lines 35-55], [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-55]), the computer program product being operable to cause a machine to:

“updating record content including in a database” (see [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-56]);

“extracting updated record content during a periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-62]);

“producing an internal file that includes data representing the updated record content” (see [column 25, lines 63-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant’s “internal document”);

“producing a file that includes data corresponding to content of the internal document” (see [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant’ “file”); and

“sending the file at the periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-67] and [column 26, lines 1-15]).

As to claim 21, Hanzek teaches:

“A system” (see Abstract, [column 6, lines 35-55], [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-55]), comprising

“a company including a computer system that updates record content including in a database” (see [column 11, lines 20-42] and [column 25, lines 45-56]),

“updated record content is extracted from the database during a periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-62]),

“the computer system produces an internal file that includes data representing the updated record content” (see [column 25, lines 63-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant’s “internal document”),

“the computer system produces a file that includes data corresponding to content of the internal document” (see [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant’ “file”), and

“the file is sent at the periodic time interval” (see [column 25, lines 50-67] and [column 26, lines 1-15]).

As to claims 2, 12 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek teaches:

“wherein the file includes Extensible Markup Language” (see [column 26, lines 8-25] wherein XML message is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claims 3, 13 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek teaches:

“wherein updating record content including adding content” (see [column 12, lines 18-22] wherein the disclosure of new order updated in order bank is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claims 6, 16 and 26, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek teaches:

“wherein the periodic time interval including a day” (see [column 11, lines 22-42] and [column 25, lines 45-55] wherein “nightly” is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claims 7, 17 and 27, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek teaches:

“wherein the periodic time interval includes a week” (see [column 11, lines 33-42] and [column 12, lines 65-67] wherein “weekly” is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claims 10, 20 and 30, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek teaches:

“repeating the updating, extracting, producing the internal document, producing the file and sending at a second periodic time interval” (see [column 12, lines 65-67] and [column 25, lines 50-55] wherein the disclosure of periodically the status process sends batch data update messages to workflow manager, wherein the process as disclosed including updating, extracting, producing a comma delimited flat file, producing a XML file and sending XML file and “periodically” also means “repeating”, is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 19, 24, 25, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanzek (US Patent No 6,980,963) as applied to claims 1, 11 and 21

above, and further in view of Goerke et al. (Employee Stock Plans Interface 1.0 Recommendation, 10/07/2002).

As to claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24 and 25, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hansek does not teach “wherein updating record content includes extending a time period in which the record content is valid” (claims 4, 14 and 24) and “wherein updating record content including shortening a time period in which the record content is valid” (claims 5, 15 and 25).

Goerke et al. teach “wherein updating record content includes extending a time period in which the record content is valid” and “wherein updating record content including shortening a time period in which the record content is valid” (see [page 20] and [page 21] for the attributes “validFrom” and “validTo” of the record content “StockPlan”, the inclusion of these attributes allows the updating record content including extending and shortening a time period in which the record content is valid as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hansek by the teaching of Goerke et al., since updating record content including extending and shortening a time period in which the record is valid provides a system more flexibility to evaluate an record content. As a result, the system can handle data processing more effectively based on valid information.

As to claims 8, 18 and 28, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek does not teach “wherein the record content includes information associated with a participant of a stock option program”.

Goerke et al. teach “wherein the record content includes information associated with a participant of a stock option program” (see [page 15, paragraphs 5-8]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanzek by the teaching of Goerke et al., since including information associated with a participant of a stock option program provides a company with an effective way to manage their employees who entitle and participate in the stock option program of the company.

As to claims 9, 19 and 29, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hanzek does not teach “wherein the record content includes information associated with stock options granted in a stock option program”.

Goerke et al. teach “wherein the record content includes information associated with stock options granted in a stock option program” (see [page 15, paragraphs 5-8]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hanzek by the teaching of Goerke et al., since including information associated with stock options granted in a stock option program provides a company

Art Unit: 2164

with an effective way to manage their stock options granted in the stock option program of the company.

10. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Donnelly et al. (US Patent No 6,049,776) teach a Resource Management System (RMS) having an RMS database containing files storing information on employees, employee skills, employee schedules and projects. The information in the files of the RMS database is obtained from external corporate database as well as from direct entry. RMS provides interfaces between the external databases and the RMS database for maintaining the information current that is stored therein.

Ostertag et al. (Publication No US 2005/0015362) teach an information exchange tool which can extract employee information from an existing enterprise resource planning system of the enterprise which provides static employee information that is updated periodically.

KLATT et al. (Publication No US 2003/0149798) teach apparatus for employing a procurement system to automatically procure printing order which includes a mirrored database.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

March 8, 2006


Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167